

## **REMARKS**

### **Overview of the Office Action**

The drawings have been objected to for including the word "Abstract".

The Abstract has been objected to for including two paragraphs.

Claims 1-3 and 13-25 have been objected to for various reasons.

Claims 1-3 and 13-25 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as indefinite.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Borchard U.S. Patent No. 4,962,868 (Borchard) in view of European Patent No.: EP 1129786 (Jansen).

Claims 13-25 have been deemed allowable if the 35 USC §112, second paragraph are addressed and overcome.

### **Status of the claims**

Claims 13-25 have been amended.

Claims 1-12 have been canceled.

Claims 13-25 remain pending.

### **Amendments to the claims**

In addition to the amendments made to address the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejections, claims 13-25 have been amended to increase clarity and readability. No new limitations have been introduced.

#### Allowable subject matter

The Office Action indicates that 13-25 have been deemed allowable if the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejections are addressed and overcome.

The 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejections have been addressed below. Therefore, claims 13-25 are now allowable.

#### Objection to the Drawings

Fig. 1 has been objected to for including the label “ABSTRACT”. Fig. 1 has been amended to remove this label. No new matter has been introduced.

#### Objection to the Abstract

The abstract has been objected to for including two paragraphs. The abstract has been amended to be one paragraph.

#### Objection to the claims

Claims 4-12 have been objected to for including multiple dependencies. Claims 4-12 have been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 13-25 have been objected to because it is not clear whether claims 13-25 were originally filed or whether claims 13-26 were originally filed.

Applicants submit that claims 13-25 were originally filed. Although there appear to be handwritten “amendments” to claims 13-26 in the originally-filed application, it was the intention of the Applicants to have the originally-filed claims be 13-25. The marked-up claims are not amendments to the set of claims 13-26. Instead, the marked-up claims are intended to be

claims 13-25 as originally filed. There was no originally-filed claim 26 and the claims have not been renumbered.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 13-25 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-3 have been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claim 13 has been rejected as indefinite because it is unclear what is being referred to as “this travel” and “this pusher”. Claim 13 has been amended to replace “this travel” with “the length of travel”, and to replace “this pusher” with “the pusher”.

Claim 13 has also been rejected as indefinite because “said piston” lacks proper antecedent basis and because it is unclear if the “piston” is referring to the plunger of a different part of the device. Claim 13 has been amended to replace “piston” with “plunger”.

Claim 17 has been rejected as indefinite because it is unclear to what the term “the hollow” is referring. Claim 17 has been amended to clarify that the “hollow” is a “hollow area” on the ramp.

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected as indefinite because it is unclear how a stud is “parked”. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to recite that the stud is disposed in a housing.

Applicants submit that these rejections have been overcome.

Rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Office Action states that the combination of Borchard and Jansen teaches all of Applicants’ recited elements.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims 1-3 by way of a continuation application.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims, in due course.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned to facilitate an early resolution of any outstanding issues.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application, it may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,  
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Edward M. Weisz  
Reg. No. 37,257  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: June 30, 2009